DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 797 CE 001 550

AUTHOR Roberts, William B.
TITLE Identifying a Power Elite in a Microcosmic Adult Community.
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Science Research; Behavior Patterns; *Decision Making; Evaluation Methods; *Group Dynamics; Group Structure; Individual Power; Interaction Process Analysis; Leadership Training; *Power Structure; Problem Solving; Statistical Analysis; Statistical Data; *Test Construction; Testing; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Power Elites

ABSTRACT

The study presents the results of testing an original obersvation instrument designed to identify a power elite in multiple sessions of two eight-member adult discussion groups. Two questions guided the development of the study: (1) Can a power elite be identified in participation training groups? (2) Can an effective observation instrument with acceptable technical characteristics be developed to identify behavior manifestations of power in participation training groups? Related literature is reviewed, testing methodology and statistical procedures discussed. The study concludes that both questions are answered affirmatively and that in support of statements made that power relations are an integral part of group processes in which decisions are made, power identification is a starting place for assessing where a group is in relation to patterns of influence in decision-making and problem-solving. A bibliography, tables, and social interaction survey are included. (MW)

ED 092797

IDENTIFYING A POWER ELITE IN A MICROCOSMIC ADULT COMMUNITY

William B. Roberts

Director of Educational Development, The Toledo Hospital

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABSTRACT

This study presents the results of testing an original observation instrument designed to identify a power elite in multiple sessions of two eight-member adult discussion groups. Three statistical tests validated the instrument's design within the .05 level of probability. (1) A one-tailed t-test was used with independent observer scoring of power behaviors in two different types of group discussion sessions (power and non-power). (2) a one-tailed Z-test was used with the scoring of power behaviors from two vantage points of observation -- external (independent observation) and internal (participant perception). (3) A one-tailed Z-test was used with independent observer scoring of power behaviors when comparing the two different groups. Reliability was found to lie within the .05 level of probability when tested through a Z-test of correlations from the two independent observers.

PROBLEM

When power emerges in democratically structured small-groups, it can either function as a vehicle for personal manipulation or as a vehicle for perpetuating the equilibrium of democratic interaction. Correct identification is significant to a behavioral scientist because he must be concerned with: (a) how power relations affect participation and decision-making in a group, and (b) what professional techniques he can use to enhance a satisfactory group experience based on the identification of power relationships. The instrument developed and tested in this study offers a significant beginning in identifying a power elite in a micro-level community.

The study involved the transformation of Robert A. Dahl's power

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE001552

model (1958) into an operational design testing for the existence of a power elite. The small-group experience used for testing the model was called Participation Training, and is referred to as a microcosmic adult community (defined below). The following two questions were proposed by the author to guide the development of this study:

1. Can a power elite be identified in participation training groups?

2. Can an effective observation instrument with acceptable technical characteristics be developed to identify behavior manifestations of power in participation training groups?

DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Power is the key term around which this study was conceived. It represents the ability of some persons to influence the decisions of others. Power cannot exist apart from a social relationship and is identified most easily in a decision-making experience. Power depends upon authority legitimized by one's status in a group and is identified by specific acts:

1. Initiation represents a concentration of power through leadership in proposing directions for group decision-making or problem-solving.

2. Persuasion represents a concentration of power through ability to control at both cognitive and affective levels a group's actions in decision-making and problem-solving.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Sanction represents a concentration of power through approval of decision-making or problem-solving directions. Sanction is the result of status or position achieved when member input is judged by a group as knowledgeable or authoritative.

4. Veto represents a concentration of power through disapproval of decision-making or problem-solving directions. Veto, like its counterpart sanction. is the result of status or position achieved when member input is judged by a group as knowledgeable or authoritative.

Power elite/ruling elite represents those group members who exercise recognizable influence in that group's decisions. These members can be identified consistently as influential over the life of the group of which they are a part.

Macro- and micro-level community represents a collective relationship of people who interact together in the achievement of certain goals or objectives. When viewed as a geographical or ecological unit, the term macro-level is used. A micro-level community describes a small (five to 15 in number) group composed of individuals representing a temporary membership. They are often brought together until the task for which they were organized is completed.

Model is used in this study with particular reference to Robert A. Dahl's conceptual framework for identifying a power elite (1958). It is a paradigm used to determine the existence or non-existence of the phenomena which it was designed to explain.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Participation Training is a learning experience categorized as a process in group dynamics. Participants move through a series of group decisions, i.e., selection of topics for discussion, formation of goals for discussion, and structuring an outline for the discussion. This process is considered more structured than other group dynamics training laboratories such as sensitivity training. It is also a realistic adult community discussion experience in that there is an agenda, and decisions must be reached in relation to that agenda. The general purpose of Participation Training is to help participants learn how to use the processes of group discussion more effectively.

Group dynamics represents the ever changing interpersonal relationships in a group. Normally, research in group dynamics involves groups small enough for each participant to engage in an interaction process with every other participant but large enough to extend beyond a triad.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

As far back as the writings of Aristotle (Jowett, 1943) the concept of community decision-making appears. In addition, the discussion of power in community decision-making and the word "elite" in relation to a segment of a population or community of people has an historical significance according to Bottomore (1964). Mills (1956) however, brought into focus the "power elite" concept. In reference to the few influencing the many, Mills holds that there is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a power elite in America composed of those whose positions enable them to control the destiny of all others in the social system of which they are a part. He maintains: (a) The decisions which they make while exercising the authority of their positions have major consequences upon their society. (b) Their failure to make decisions is of greater consequences than the decisions they do make. This is because of the pivotal positions they occupy in the social system.

In response to Mills (1956) Dahl (1958) believed that a power elite concept could be subjected to a valid and reliable test, he proposed the following ruling elite model:

"1. The hypothetical ruling elite is a well defined group.

2. There is a fair sampling of cases involving key political discussions in which the preferences of a hypothetical ruling elite run counter to those of any other likely group that might be suggested.

3. In such cases, the preferences of the elite regularly prevail." (1958:466)

Dahl has taken the stand that unless those who propose that a ruling elite exists in a particular situation support that claim with empirical evidence, it does not represent a scientific theory. He further states that the burden of proof for validating such a theory lies with the proponents of the theory. In a logical and systematic exposition, he defines his concept of a ruling elite. He then proposes that his test be used in an examination of a series

of concrete decisions reached by a specific group in a community or nation. Dahl's frame of reference is that of a political system in a macro-level community; however, the arguments for use of his model seem applicable to a micro-level community. Hence, they inspired the research of this paper.

The justification for the use of the word community as descriptive of a group dynamics experience is found in the writings of several social scientists. Bonner (1959) discusses community as group dynamics. His approach is more restrictive than the common definitions of the word community as found in most sociological and political science literature. In Sociology, the use of the word community is often a referent for a geographical area or ecological unit, i.e., neighborhood, town, city, or region. Bonner's definition holds that community can be a social grouping in which interaction is the fundamental process.

Nisbet (1953) discusses both secondary associations such as work groups and primary associations such as families functioning as small communities within larger communities. Hence, the allegiances and memberships of men cannot be isolated from the larger systems of authority that prevail in society whether religious, economic, or political. Therefore, the way power reveals itself in practical operation determines the smaller contexts of association and is determined by them. To discover, understand, and predict the consequences of power in large social systems, one must begin with analysis of the

social group, the basic association of men in larger society. This discussion, supported further by Hawley's concept (1970) of a community as an energy system, provided the rationale for the present study.

In order to arrive at the proper components of power behavior to be identified in a micro-level community group dynamics experience, criteria needed to be set for selection. The criteria selected were those: Power behavior categories which were (a) exhaustive of the universe of power, (b) mutually exclusive of other dimensions, and (c) translatable into conceptual dimensions of power.

In order to select the appropriate components of power behaviors to be identified in a group dynamics experience, research into available instrumentation covering the same ground was needed. More than 70 group observation instruments, and more than 40 field or laboratory studies related to power in social behavior were surveyed. Analysis of these instruments revealed that none were designed to do what was desired for this study. Many globally recognized instruments were considered such as those by Heyns (1948), Benne and Sheets (1948), and Bales (1951). Therefore, the following instrument and attached Participant Survey were devised to test for power elite identification in a small-group discussion:

--- "Observer's Report and Social Interaction Survey About here" ---

In arriving at the components of power selected for the instrument, the writings and references of Rose (1967) on "camps" of the meaning of power in community provided the basic research. Rose refers to several authors who discuss the meaning of power in community

relationships in such a way that "camps" have evolved. Some define power as potential and do not move beyond a definitional framework. Others define power as actual meaning a behavioral phenomenon. These look to participation in decision-making processes for their supportive evidence. Mills, Lasswell, Kaplan, Hunter, and Dahl represent the latter group whom Rose supports.

Rose's statement of support is congruent with the design of this study. Power is identifiable only when it is actual. This makes it a behavioral phenomenon, and it is in decision-making groups such as Participation Training that power behaviors can be identified. To be actual, power must account for influencing the decisions of the group in which it is exercised.

French's and Raven's five bases of power -- reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert -- as reported in Cartwright and Zander (1970) was also fundamental to this study. In addition, Parson's explanation (1969) of the authority/legitimacy concept of power first introduced by Weber was used as a reference together with Barnard (1938), Barnlund and Haiman (1960), Bonner (1959), and Etzioni (1970). These sources provided the focus from which the power components of sanction and veto were derived. The power behavior component of persuasion was derived from Cartwright's and Zander's discussion of influence with supportive writings of Rose (1967) and Barnard (1938). Argyle (1967) contributed most to initiation as a separate power behavior component with support from the writings of Barnard (1938), Barnlund and Haiman (1960), and Barber (1966).

POPULATION AND TESTING METHODOLOGY

Although any small group experience in which decisions are made might have been appropriate for testing the above instrument. Participation Training was chosen because it focused on the following according to Bergevin and McKinley (1965): (a) freedom of expression, (b) clarity of communication, (c) listening to and understanding others, and (d) developing consensus about the meaning of ideas so that group discussion can succeed. Because of these reasons and because Participation Training is a somewhat structured experience, it seemed probable that Dahl's power model (1958) could be made operational in participation training groups.

The selection of participation training groups came from one of Indiana University's institutes in Adult Education conducted by the Bureau of Studies in Adult Education. These institutes are training programs for persons who are concerned with improving the educational effectiveness of their community agencies and organizations. In view of the time parameters for embarking upon and completing this study, the May 1973 institute at Indiana University was selected for the sample from which the data would be collected. During the preceding year, however, the power identification instrument was tested repeatedly on approximately 60 participants for perfecting the power components and the scoring procedure. The May institute was composed of 16 participants, which meant there were two small discussion groups of eight members each. These two groups were identified as Group A and Group B. Because the institute was a training experience,

the length of each small discussion group varied. At the beginning of the institute, discussion periods were 45 minutes in length but increased to two hours by the end of the institute. The criteria used in selecting sessions for observation were these: (a) An equal number of sessions of each type was considered for each group. (b) Representative sessions from each stage of training development were considered for each group. (c) Sessions of each type were considered for equal length for each group. Based on these criteria, all possible sessions of each group, A and B, were used on an alternating basis throughout the tenure of each group's development. One "speech/forum" session and four "discussion" sessions for each group were used.

Since one major aspect of the study was differentiating between sessions where a power elite was operative versus those where there was no power elite operative, the observation instrument was used in both types of small group sessions. Two small group "speech/forum" sessions were selected for observation of non-elite operation, and eight small group "discussion" sessions were selected for elite operation. The judgement of when an elite was operative or non-operative was determined by the designated trainer of the participation sessions observed. After each session was observed, a trainer was asked to certify whether behaviors of initiation, sanction, veto, and persuasion were manifest to a considerable degree during the session.

Another major aspect of the study called for discerning any

significant differences between observations by two different observers using the observation instrument. One observer, in addition to the author of this study, was trained in the use of the observation instrument. Both collected data on the selected "speech/forum" and "discussion" sessions of each of the two groups.

In summary, two trained observers collected data: (a) on four group "discussion" sessions of each group, A and B, and (b) on one "speech/forum" session of each group, A and B. It was assumed that a power elite could be identified in the group "discussion" sessions but not in the "speech/forum" sessions. Ten sessions out of twenty-one were used for data collection in Indiana University's May 1973 Participation Training Institute.

At the end of each session observed, the Social Interaction Survey form was distributed for completion to be correlated with observer's data.

STATISTICAL PROCEDURES USED

The statistical analysis of data collected in this study followed the pattern outlined below as it relates to each of the research hypotheses stated:

1. A power elite can be identified in a participation training discussion group by the distribution of acts of power observed.

To test this hypothesis, the variance in participant scores in each type of session was calculated, and a t-test was used to determine whether the variances differed significantly in the two types of sessions. The central tendancy for each group was also checked to

ascertain whether all scores in the non-power sessions would be as low as predicted.

2. The correlation between one observer and another using the observation instrument on a participation training group is not significantly different from 1.00.

To test this hypothesis, the total scores of power identification were collected per session from each of two independent observers. Based on these data, the Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient was used to determine the degree of correlation between the scoring of the two independent observers. A Fisher's Z-transformation was used to test the hypothesis that this correlation co-efficient was not significantly different from 1.00. The test statistic was a Z-test.

3. The correlation between observer and participant identification of a power elite in participation training is not significantly different from 1.00.

To test this hypothesis, the total scores of observed power identification per group member were collected per session by independent observers. Then, from the responses of participants on the survey, the Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient was used to determine the degree of correlation between the scoring of each observer on each group member and the scoring of all participants on each group member in their group. A Fisher's Z-transformation was used to test the hypothesis that this correlation co-efficient was not significantly different from 1.00. The test statistic used was

a Z-test.

4. The correlation between observer and participant identification of a power elite in one participation training group is not significantly different from that of a second group.

To test this hypothesis, data were collected on each of two independent groups using procedures discussed under Hypothesis Number Three. The Pearson product moment correlation was used to report two dimensions in testing this hypothesis: (a) the correlation between observers; and participants' scoring for each group, and (b) the correlation between observers' and participants' identification of a power elite in like sessions of the two groups. Data were collected in those sessions of each group in which it was assumed a power elite would be operative and in those sessions of each group in which it was assumed there would be no power elite operative. Fisher's Z-transformation was used to test the hypothesis that the correlation between the observers and the participants for each group and for each type of session were not significantly different. The test statistic was a Z-test.

FINDINGS

It was ascertained from checking the central tendency of power scores for each session that the scores in the non-power sessions were as low as predicted.

In addition to checking the central tendancy of power scores, a one-tailed t-test of observer scores for both power and non-power sessions supported the hypothesis that the observation instrument

was a valid means for identifying a power elite in participation training groups. Tables 1 and 2 display the results of comparing each of the four discussion (power) dessions observed with the one speech/forum (non-power) session observed in each group. The findings for accepting the first hypothesis through a t-test were expected to lie within the .05 level of significance. In session five, Table 1, the observation of power behaviors tested against session 11, the non-power session, yielded a level of significance within a .10 level of probability. The other power sessions tested against session 11 yielded a higher level of significance, out to .01 in Table 1.

--- "Table 1 about here" ---

Table 2 shows an even greater consistency in the levels of significance. The findings from sessions 4 and 14 when tested against session 11, the non-power session, lie within the .025 level of significance, while the findings from session 12 tested against session 11 lie within the .01 level of significance. All other findings lie within the .05 level of significance.

--- "Table 2 about here" ---

From the data collected by both observers, the findings reveal that the first hypothesis of the study was accepted.

The second hypothesis of the study focused on the reliability of the observation instrument. The test of this hypothesis through the Fisher Z-transformation revealed no significant difference in the Pearson product moment correlations calculated between observers

and an rxy of 1.

--- "Table 3 about here" ---

Correlations in observer data for Group A showed consistent increase while correlations in Group B fluctuated to some degree. The correlation level in the last session of Group A was within the .01 level of probability; the findings from all other sessions were within the .05 level of probability. The one speech/forum (non-power) session in each group revealed zero correlation, because no behaviors of power were observed as predicted. The second hypothesis was supported by the Z-test.

The third hypothesis represented a further test of the validity of the observation instrument. At the end of each session observed, participants were asked by means of a survey form to identify by name those in their group who exhibited behaviors of initiation, sanction, veto, and persuasion. Tabulation of these results was compared with those of each observer who scored participant behavior in the same categories.

Through the Pearson product moment correlation formula, correlations were calculated between observer and participant scores. From these correlations, a Z-test was used to test the hypothesis. This test verified that no significant differences were found to exceed the .05 level of probability with all members of Group A except one. However, there were several significant differences found in Group B. Tables 4 and 5 show these results.

--- "Tables 4 & 5 about here" ---

Although there was a wide spread among the correlations between observers and participants revealed in Tables 4 and 5, the Z-transformations of most correlations confirm the hypothesis because the findings lie within the .05 level of probability of a bivariate normal distribution from a one-tailed test.

Deviations from expectations were accountable (1) to participants' attitudes toward preserving the team consensus nature of Participation Training in Group B, (2) to the observers' decision not to explain the significance of the participant survey to the participants for fear of biasing the study (This step was needed in Group B but not in Group A because of point one above and point three below.), (3) to the personality differences between participants in Group A compared to Group B, and (4) to a discrepency in scoring procedure realized, then corrected by the observers during the observation experiences.

The proof of the fourth hypothesis of the study represented the final test of validity for the observation instrument. It focused on significant differences which might have existed in using the instrument with two different groups. Two dimensions of this hypothesis were tested from the data collected. The Fisher Z-transformation through the Pearson product moment correlation supported no significant differences between observer and participant correlations in more than half the sessions in each group. Those sessions which did reveal differences between observer scoring and participant scoring exceeding the .05 level of significance ex-

pected were accountable to the same sources as explained under the last hypothesis analysis.

It can be concluded that the statistical procedures chosen to test the four hypotheses of this study provided comprehensive measurement for the validity and reliability of the observation instrument devised. Each hypothesis was supported at the desired level of significance while some of the findings supported the hypotheses beyond the desired level of significance. With improvement in observer scoring, as mentioned, and with accompanying explanations in interpreting the Participant Interaction Survey, if used, higher correlations and more significant levels of testing than did appear could result. Yet, as the findings stand, a reliable observation instrument for identifying a power elite in a microcosmic adult community has been validated.

CONCLUSIONS

It was found from the results of this study that the two questions posed to guide the study were answered affirmatively.

1. A power elite can be identified in participation training groups.

2. An effective observation instrument with acceptable technical characteristics for identifying power behaviors in participation training groups has been developed for use.

The review of related literature from the social sciences provided a comprehensive review of the theoretical concepts of power so that components of power identification could be synthesized in-

to an operational design. This design for observation, and its development through pilot-testing, has accounted for the degree of validity and reliability of the instrument as reported in this study. Through the instrument's use, a power elite has been identified in the two participation training groups by the distribution of acts of power observed. The testing of the instrument has both validated its design and established its reliability through positive correlations between (a) two independent observers, (b) two different groups, (c) two different types of functions of the two different groups (power and non-power sessions), and (d) two vantage points of observation -- external (independent observation) and internal (participant perception).

It can be concluded, in support of statements made that power relations are an integral part of group processes in which decisionsare made; therefore, power identification is a starting place for assessing where a group is in relation to patterns of influence in "community" decision-making and problem-solving. The source for examples of community decision-making and problem-solving has been participation training experiences. These experiences involve the making of a series of group decisions for discussion and involve problem-solving in program planning. Although Participation Training is not structured to recognize power relations, power relations did develop in each group observed, and were identified by what has been proved a valid and reliable instrument.

REFERENCES

Argyle, M., 1967. The Psychology of Interpersonal Behavior. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Jowett, Benjamin (Tr.), 1943. Aristotle's Politics. New York: The Modern Library.

Bales, R. F., 1951. Interaction Process Analysis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Wesley Press.

Barber, J. D., 1966. Power in Committees. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Barnard, C. I., 1938. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Barnlund, D. O., & Haiman, F. S., 1960. The Dynamics of Discussion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Benne, K. O. and Sheats, P., 1948. "Functional Roles of Group Members." Journal of Social Issues 4: 41-49

Bergevin, P., & McKinley, J., 1965. Participation Training for Adult Education. St. Louis: Bethany Press.

Bonner, H., 1959. Group Dynamics: Principles and Applications. New York: Ronald Press.

Bottomore, T. B., 1964. Elites and Society. New York: Basic Books.

Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (Eds.), 1970. Group Dynamics. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson.

Dahl, R. A., 1958. "A Criteria of the Ruling Elite Model." American Political Science Review 52: 463-469

Etzioni, A., 1970. "Power as a Societal Force." In M. E. Olsen (Ed.) Power in Societies. New York: Macmillan.

Hawley, A., 1970. "Power as an Attribute of Social Systems." In M. E.Olsen (Ed.) Power in Societies. New York: Macmillan.

Heyns, R. W., 1949. Effects of Variations in Leadership on Participant Behavior in Discussion Groups. Doctorial Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, #1172.

Mills, C. W., 1956. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nisbet, R., 1953. The Quest of Community. New York: Oxford University Press.

Parsons, T., 1969. Politics and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Rose, A., 1967. The Power Structure of Political Process in American Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

Table 1

Tests of Significant Differences

Between Power (P) and Non-Power (NP) Sessions for Observer I

Group A		Group B	
Sessions:	4 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	5 (P) and 11 (NP)
S^2	12.21	S^2	10.50
Sd	3.49	Sd	32.40
t	2.22*	t	.15*
*p	< .01	*p	< .10
Sessions:	6 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	7 (P) and 11 (NP)
S^2	18.13	S^2	21.12
Sd	4.26	Sd	4.60
t	1.44*	t	1.60*
*p	< .05	*p	< .05
Sessions:	12 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	13 (P) and 11(NP)
S^2	10.69	S^2	28.57
Sd	3.27	Sd	5.34
t	1.87*	t	1.63*
*p	< .025	*p	< .05
Sessions:	14 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	18 (P) and 11 (NP)
S^2	30.21	S^2	21.90
Sd	5.50	Sd	4.68
t	1.50*	t	1.34*
*p	< .05	*p	< .05

Table 2

Tests of Significant Differences

Between Power (P) and Non-Power (NP) Sessions for Observer II

Group A		Group B	
Sessions:	4 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	5 (P) and 11 (NP)
S^2	15.56	S^2	8.70
Sd	3.82	Sd	2.55
t	1.93*	t	1.40*
*p	$< .025$	*p	$< .05$
Sessions:	6 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	7 (P) and 11 (NP)
S^2	23.71	S^2	19.99
Sd	4.87	Sd	4.47
t	1.54*	t	1.71*
*p	$< .05$	*p	$< .05$
Sessions:	12 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	13 (P) and 11 (NP)
S^2	8.21	S^2	24.23
Sd	2.87	Sd	4.92
t	2.18*	t	1.48*
*p	$< .01$	*p	$< .05$
Sessions:	14 (P) and 11 (NP)	Sessions:	18 (P) and 11 (NP)
S^2	11.64	S^2	15.00
Sd	3.41	Sd	3.87
t	1.83*	t	1.55*
*p	$< .025$	*p	$< .05$

Table 3

Correlation of Observer Data

in Observing Power Behaviors

per Session Observed

Group A			Group B		
	rxy	Z		rxy	Z
Sessions: 4	.80	.22*	Sessions: 5	.89	.94*
6	.91	1.18*	7	.83	.42*
11[a]	0	0	11[a]	0	0
12	.91	1.18*	13	.92	1.17*
14	.95	1.86**	18	.86	.55*

[a]denotes non-power sessions

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$

Table 4

Correlation of Observer I Data

and Participant Data

in Rating Power Behaviors per Member Observed

in Discussion Sessions (Cumulative)

	Group A			Group B		
		rxy	Z		rxy	Z
Members:	A	.962	.95*	A	.945	.78*
	B	.825	.17*	B	.574	.66*
	C	.816	.14*	C	.404	-.57
	D	.924	.62*	D	.727	-.08
	E	.895	.45*	E	.592	-.32
	F	.064	-.94	F	.706	-.12
	G	.864	.31*	G	.866	.31*
	H	.843	.24*	H	.255	-.74

*p < .05 *p < .05

Table 5

Correlations of Observer II Data

and Participant Data

in Rating Power Behaviors per Member Observed

in Discussion Sessions (Cumulative)

	Group A			Group B		
		rxy	Z		rxy	Z
Members:	A	.899	.47*	A	.792	.07*
	B	.981	1.29*	B	.055	-.95
	C	.922	.59*	C	.272	-.72
	D	.976	1.19*	D	.516	-.43
	E	.894	.45*	E	.427	-.55
	F	.324	-.66	F	.745	-.02
	G	.956	.89*	G	.772	.02*
	H	.971	1.09*	H	.800	.09*

*p < .05 *p < .05

Observer's Report of Power Elite Identification

Group Identification _____ Session Number _____

List each participant's name in the upper part of the matrix below in a sequential order. As the discussion in each session proceeds, record opposite the component of power observed, and under the name of the participant responsible, a plus (+) sign representing identification of an act of power as often as it is distinguishable. This will form a series of plus signs to be totaled for each component row and each person column.

Initiates new ideas or directions for the group to consider, i.e. "I would like .../ I think .../ It seems to me .../ Why don't we ..."										
Sanctions positively. Demonstrates authoritative knowledge of points of view before the group, i.e. "I can accept .../ This is good because .../ Based on _____, this (or) that is what we have to do ..."										
Vetoes, opposes, or disagrees with points of view before the group. Adopts authoritative posture against counter positions, i.e. "I cannot agree .../ But, there's a problem with .../ If we do that ..."										
Persuades participants to accept or change points of view, or reinforces own position. (Dominating monologues of varying lengths addressed to one or more in the group regarding ideas or directions already initiated.)										

Social Interaction Survey

Please read each statement below, then circle the YES or the NO to the right of each statement (a), whichever response best fits your group experience. Complete each statement (b), (c), and (d) when each is applicable.

1. (a) Most new ideas or directions for the group to consider were initiated by the same few participants. YES NO

   (b) (If YES) The following participants could be identified as those few:_____

   (c) Did the behavior of those few seem to prevail over the group? YES NO

   (d) If not, please identify those who did prevail.

   _____

2. (a) A few sanctioned positively ideas and directions before the group by demonstrating authoritative knowledge of content or procedure. They seemed to give permission to proceed. YES NO

   (b) (If YES) The following participants could be identified as those few:_____

   (c) Did the behavior of those few seem to prevail over the group? YES NO

   (d) If not, please identify those who did prevail.

   _____

3. (a) A few vetoed, opposed, or disagreed with points of view before the group. They adopted an authoritative posture against counter positions. YES NO

   (b) (If YES) The following participants could be identified as those few:_____

   (c) Did the behavior of those few seem to prevail over the group? YES NO

   (d) If not, please identify those who did prevail.

   _____

Social Interaction Survey

(page 2)

4. (a) Those who felt strongly about their positions persuaded participants to accept or change points of view, or reinforced their own positions with dominating monologues. YES NO

(b) (If YES) The following participants could be identified as those few:_____

(c) Did the behavior of those few seem to prevail over the group? YES NO

(d) If not, please identify those who did prevail.

_____